DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 418 053 SP 037 842

AUTHOR Cadray, Joseph P.; McAllister, Gretchen
TITLE Educating Culturally Responsive Teachers: An Introduction to Process-Oriented or Developmental Approaches.
PUB DATE 1998-02-25
NOTE 54p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (New Orleans, LA, February 25-28, 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Action Research; Consciousness Raising; *Cultural Awareness; Culturally Relevant Education; *Diversity (Student); Elementary Secondary Education; Faculty Development; Higher Education; *Multicultural Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Behavior; Teacher Educators; Teacher Improvement; Urban Education

ABSTRACT

This paper shares research from two professional development initiatives that focused on changes in teacher educators' and teachers' multicultural thinking, discussing the use of a developmental perspective to structure and evaluate such initiatives. The first study involved an action research project that examined six teacher educators' experiences during committee work designed to enhance multiculturalism during teacher preparation. The intervention attempted to reduce the gap between the college's multicultural mission and the traditional practice of Teacher Preparation Committee members. During the first intervention session, participants discussed the perceived gap, then in a second session, they reacted to data from the first and discussed alternative frames of preparing teachers for cultural diversity. They progressed through four stages of reflective understanding (basic, strategic, communicative, and transformational). The second study investigated 11 diverse classroom teachers' experiences in a professional development program designed to enhance their thinking about children's cultures and its practical applications in the classroom. The context for the study was the professional development center, CULTURES (Center for Urban Learning/Teaching and Urban Research in Education and Schools), which helps practicing teachers work more effectively with diverse students in urban settings. Pre- and post-CULTURES interviews with participants indicated that teachers changed their view of cultural differences and cross-cultural behaviors. Teachers exhibited more ethnorelative behavior and thinking after the intervention. (Contains 52 references.) (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 418 053

EDUCATING CULTURALLY RESPONSIVE TEACHERS: AN INTRODUCTION TO PROCESS-ORIENTED OR DEVELOPMENTAL APPROACHES

Joseph P. Cadray, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Emory University
Division of Educational Studies

and

Gretchen McAllister, M.A.
Doctoral Candidate
Emory University
Division of Educational Studies

A Paper presented at the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE)
50th Annual Meeting & Exhibits, New Orleans, Louisiana, February 25-28, 1998.

SP037842

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Cadray

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Introduction

Urban school teachers face increasing challenges in constructing pedagogy, classroom climate, and curricula that foster the academic success of all children, many of whom come from different socioeconomic, racial, and cultural backgrounds. Recent data indicate that most urban schools consist of children of color (Villegas, 1991), of students with limited English proficiency (Zeichner, 1994), and of children below the poverty line (Children's Defense Fund, 1991). The national teaching corps has been and continues to be fairly homogeneous -- predominately white, English speaking, and middle-class females (Grant & Secada, 1990). In addition, teachers' lack of experience and familiarity with violence, poverty, drugs, language issues, or discrimination have complicated their task of educating students.

Historically, professional development has been a vehicle for assisting teachers in gaining the knowledge and skills necessary to respond to the changing educational goals and needs of the children. Teacher training often has consisted of bringing in experts who share information on various new types of instructional techniques or tools. This method did not utilize teachers' own knowledge as a source of learning nor embed the information in the context of teachers' lives or classrooms (Moll & Gonzalez, 1997; Sparks, 1995). These ineffective, decontextualized, short-term, in-service or staff development workshops have been the predominant structure for training teachers.

Various researchers have pointed out characteristics that are necessary for effective learning of multicultural perspectives: placing the teacher's needs within the context of student learning and outcomes (Woods and Thompson, 1993), contextualizing the learning in the

teacher's setting (Little, 1993), and providing teachers with continuous institutional support. In addition, the learning process for teachers should be constructivist (Cochran-Smith, 1995 ; Sparks, 1995; Woods & Thompson, 1993) and collaborative in nature (Cochran-Smith, 1995; Inger, M., 1995; Little, 1993; Sparks & Loucks-Horsley, 1989) and involve various methodologies, such as reflection, lecture, discussion groups, community visits, and coaching. Besides the learning process, urban multicultural teacher education should address issues of equity, assessment (Little, 1993), and achievement (Irvine, 1990; Villegas, 1991) among a diverse population and take into account the influence of culture upon one's self and others (Baker, 1983).

The limited research on various staff development projects addressing multicultural education indicates that interventions are weak and outcomes are minimal (Grant & Tate, 1995). The inconsistent findings of the few studies that have been done have not helped the field develop an understanding of how to create an effective process within teacher education to foster the desired changes in teachers. Grant and Secada (1990) refer to the scant research in this area:

> A basic tenet of education is that instruction should follow development. Yet, we have no maps of how teacher cognition, beliefs, and skills with respect to the teaching of diverse student populations actually develop ... if we could map how teachers move from the former to the latter, we might be able to plan teacher education programs to help teachers develop these skills. (p. 419.

In the fields of education, as well as counseling and intercultural relations, practitioners and researchers have used developmental frameworks to describe how people's cultural selves and cross-cultural skills develop. Though stage-based models have received criticism regarding

their universal application and their oversimplification of a complex process (Jones, 1990), they have been useful in designing training for cross-cultural learning in the fields of counseling and intercultural relations (Bennett, 1993).

Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to share research from two professional development initiatives that focused on the changes, from a developmental perspective, in teacher educators' and teachers' multicultural thinking. Moreover, the paper provides a discussion of the use of a developmental perspective to structure and evaluate such initiatives.

The first study shares the results from an action research project that examined six teacher educators' experiences during committee work designed to enhance multiculturalism in a teacher preparation program. The second study presents the results of a study of 11 classroom teachers' experiences in a professional development program designed to enhance their thinking about children's cultures, and its practical applications in the classroom.

Significance

Each of us holds a particular world view through which we interpret the world around us. These world views, which are shaped by the cultures in which we live (Singer, 1987), form the basis of our thinking about cultural differences, as well as inform our cross-cultural choices and actions. This thinking, that includes beliefs and principles, provides a significant context for making choices about our behaviors and attitudes (Rios, 1996).

Teachers mediate their pedagogy and curriculum through their cultural or interpretive framework (Brislin, 1981; Shade, 1989). Bennett (1989) points out that what a teacher interprets as good or bad depends on her world view. Some researchers have attributed the lack of

educational success of children of color, especially those in poor urban areas, to teachers' limited understanding of the students' cultures (Irvine, 1990). This lack of understanding often emanates from the cultural gap between the teachers and their students. Teachers' lack of knowledge regarding their children's cultures has led to low expectations, remediation, harsh disciplining of children of color, and blaming children's classroom problems, whether academic or behavioral, on the children's home environment (Irvine, 1990).

Researchers assert that, in order for teachers to interact effectively with their children, they must confront their own racism and biases (Banks, 1994; Gillete & Boyle-Baise, 1995; Nieto & Rolon, 1995), learn about their students' cultures, and perceive the world through diverse cultural lenses (Banks, 1994; Gillete & Boyle-Baise, 1995; Nieto & Rolon, 1995; Sleeter, 1992; Villegas, 1991). Other researchers have listed desired qualities of one who is able to interact effectively with other cultures. Gudykunst and Kim (1984) describe the person as one:

> who has achieved an advanced level in the process of becoming intercultural and whose cognitive, affective, and behavioral characteristics are not limited but are open to growth beyond the psychological parameters of only one culture ... The intercultural person possesses an intellectual and emotional commitment to the fundamental unity of all humans and, at the same time, accepts and appreciates the differences that lie between people of different cultures. (p. 230)

Added to this is the commitment to combating racism and "all forms of prejudice and discrimination, through the development of appropriate understanding, attitudes, and social action skills" (Bennett, p. 263, 1995).

This process of learning about cultures, one's own and others', can be filled with ambiguity and perceived psychological risks (Paige, 1993). Paige, in his work on risks of intercultural education, lists several reasons why. Some of these risks include: (a) sense of fear emanating from reflections on cultures which people do not have a lot of experience with, (b) feelings of guilt and confusion from discussing and reflecting on highly personalized behaviors and, (c) experiencing frustration and excitement as people uncover new ways of understanding the world and the nature of life (Brislin, 1981; Paige, 1993). If teachers are to rise to the challenge, they need support from administrators and colleagues, as well as systematic and meaningful learning experiences.

It is increasingly evident that transmission models or one-day in-service models of teacher education are not adequate in fostering the type of cross-cultural learning necessary for teacher educators preparing teachers for diverse classrooms and teachers working with diverse student populations (Cochran-Smith, 1995). Collaborative and reflective models have been suggested as being more useful, empowering, and effective than transmission models of teacher education (Cochran-Smith, 1995; Wingard, 1995). Collaborative and reflective models require that teachers think about their own practice as well as issues of diversity (Little, 1993; Lawrence & Tatum, 1997; St. John, 1990). Cochran-Smith (1995) and others (Banks, 1994; Gillette & Boyle-Baise, 1995) make the case that "teaching culturally diverse learners is dependent on teachers' interpretations, ideologies, and practices within local school cultures and community contexts and that professional development [including teacher preparation] must take this into account" (Cochran-Smith, 1995, p. 34).

Little is known about how teachers develop their capacities for reflectivity and intercultural sensitivity -- capabilities needed to teach effectively in diverse classroom settings. Few models exist to explain how multicultural reflective understanding is developed. The research in the area of professional development addressing multicultural issues in the classroom is scant (Grant & Tate, 1995; Wingard, 1995). The research shared in this paper hopes to contribute toward increased understanding in this area.

Developmental Theories or Models

Traditionally, *developmental* refers to those theories that describe psychological or physical changes in a person. In a strict sense, developmental theories must conform to specific criteria such as a set of invariant hierarchical stages which are biologically based. In the context of this paper the term will be used in a more comprehensive way and refer to those models or theories which describe the changing process of a person's understanding of the cultural, racial, or ethnic self and others. Growth will be defined by stages or levels which progress in a hierarchical fashion moving towards a telos or ending state.

Developmental frameworks

Developmental and stage-based models have been historically used to understand cognitive and social growth in children and adults. For example, Piaget's theory of cognitive development has been used to structure curriculum and learning opportunities for children. Likewise, Kohlberg's theory of moral development has assisted educators with understanding how children and adults solve ethical dilemmas. Many of these developmental models have been beneficial for developing curriculum and framing learning experiences.

Developmental frameworks have been both commended for their assistance to the field of education, as well as criticized for their limitations. Regarding advantages of such frameworks, developmental models that describe how a person grows in terms of his identity or world view, can assist educators in three areas: predicting and understanding teachers' behaviors, sequencing course content, and creating conducive learning environments. On the other hand, they have been criticized for several reasons, such as, oversimplification of complex problems (Jones, 1991; Loevinger, 1976), and generalization across race and gender (Rowe et al., 1994), as well as diminished personal agency (Meyers et al, 1990), and lack of empirical verification.

The Studies

The studies shared in this paper reflect two attempts to gain a deeper understanding of the cross-cultural learning process. Using developmental models from other fields, as has been done in these studies, may assist teacher educators and teachers to better understand the process of becoming multicultural.

The following sections present two studies that employed developmental frameworks in their analysis. Study one examines six teacher educators' reflective development during a multicultural curricular enhancement process in their department. Study two describes 11 teachers' thinking before and after a professional development multicultural seminar. Following these two sections, implications for teacher education will be discussed.

STUDY ONE

At the outset of this study, the purpose was to test the hypothesis that a gap existed between the stated mission of the Southland City University College of Education (SCU-COE)

and the actual practices of faculty members. The SCU-COE espoused a mission to prepare professionals for service in culturally diverse settings. Members of the college's standing Teacher Preparation Committee, those teacher educators most involved in the undergraduate teacher preparation program, were charged with enhancing the function of the program. In order to test the researcher's hypothesis, participant observations, document reviews, and one-on-one interviews were conducted relative the professional practices of Teacher Preparation Committee members. The action research data obtained indicated that committee members held Traditional views of teacher preparation which are based on Technical, Academic, and Developmental framing assumptions (see Cadray, 1995, p. 24-26). Committee members' views virtually excluded Alternative views of teacher preparation which are based on Single-Group Studies, Multicultural Education, and Multicultural & Social Reconstruction framing assumptions (see Cadray, 1995, p. 26-28). The data were used as evidence to support the researcher's claim about the existence of a mission-practice gap (Cadray, 1995).

Based on action research findings, an intervention process was designed and implemented to develop the reflective capacities of individual Teacher Preparation Committee members (Cadray, 1995). The interventionist assumed that by confronting and critically reflecting on the actual theories they use (theories-in-use), Teacher Preparation Committee members could develop the capacity to transform those theories, if they choose to do so (Argyris, 1993). The interventionist also assumed that the extent to which Teacher Preparation Committee members' theories-in-use could be altered would determine the influence the intervention would have on transforming the formal teacher preparation curriculum (Argyris, 1993).

The nature of the questions which drove the research are related to the literature and theoretical frames which are reviewed in the full report of the study (see Cadray, 1995). The study focused on three research questions:

> (1) Is there a gap between the espoused SCU-COE mission and the theories of teacher preparation used by Teacher Preparation Committee members?
> (2) How would Teacher Preparation Committee members react to meaningful feedback about the perceived gap?
> (3) Would the feedback and subsequent discussions relative to the perceived gap influence Teacher Preparation Committee members' capacities to transform individual theories-in-use as well as the formal teacher preparation curriculum?

Methodology

The Context and the Actors

The preparation of teachers has been one of primary functions of the SCU-COE since its inception. Faculty members within the college's Curriculum and Instruction Department (CID) are primarily responsible for constructing the teacher preparation curriculum model. Over the past two decades the composition of the full-time CID faculty has remained virtually unchanged.

Within an institutional context defined in large measure by a desegregation agreement and an administrative espousal of an urban mission, the SCU-COE faculty began to project an image, through text, designed to reflect a more specific focus on the urban character of Southland City. For example, the text of education programs during the 1980's, including teacher preparation, began to focus greater emphasis on a mission to prepare professionals for service in urban settings. The reader should not infer, however, that COE faculty owned that urban mission ideal. Given the fact that the urban mission was imposed through the desegregation agreement, faculty could respond in ways that would only project the appearance of a focus on the diversity and urban character of Southland City. Indeed, CID faculty could have interpreted an urban

mission to simply mean more field-based experiences for students in the increasingly diverse (predominantly black) urban settings of Southland County Public Schools without really changing the way they framed their personal and collective teacher preparation practices.

During the Fall term prior to the initiation of this study, the CID faculty appointed a new Teacher Preparation Committee. The new Teacher Preparation Committee's specific charge was to reconsider the changes proposed by previous departmental committees, and recommend ways in which the function of undergraduate teacher preparation program could be further enhanced. Members of the Teacher Preparation Committee were the most desirable faculty population within the college for the purposes of this action research project. The Teacher Preparation Committee was ideal for gathering data that could be used to describe and analyze the theories used by those teacher educators most involved in the enhancement of the teacher preparation program. The Teacher Preparation Committee was composed of two full professors -- Carol, a White female and Craven, a White male; one assistant professor -- Juliana, a Black female; and three college instructors -- Jane & Nell, two White females; and one Black male, the researcher and interventionist. The Teacher Preparation Committee began its work during the 1993 Spring Term.

The Intervention Process

Argyris and Schon (1978) found that individuals learn new behaviors through a process of feedback about and personal reflection on their own theories-in-use. Theories-in-use are those that can be inferred from participant actions, including talk (Argyris, Putnam and Smith, 1987). Through a process of actively inquiring into and reflecting on their personal actions, participants become aware of their theories-in-use, and this triggers a range of reactions. For example,

Argyris (1987) found that participants developed an increased capacity to reflect on their existing theories-in-use and "...work toward consistently enacting new rules...that could yield new consequences" (p. 274). Moreover, "...[b]asic assumptions or frames about what it meant and took to learn new skills and manage the learning process became more evident, and the process of reframing the learning process gradually began to emerge" (p. 274).

In this study, the methodologies used to answer the research questions mirrored Argyris' (1993) broad methodological framework for researching and intervening in an organizational setting. Argyris' research and intervention methodologies are characterized by continuous data collection and analysis. Descriptions of data collection and analysis activities are interwoven with descriptions of the research and intervention activities which characterized this study: researching the institutional context and practitioners' actions (observing and interviewing), organizing research findings, conducting meaningful feedback sessions for the purpose of promoting change (learning), and assessing the consequences of the intervention (Argyris, 1993).

The initial phase of the intervention involved organizing action research findings for feedback and discussion sessions with Teacher Preparation Committee members. The researcher's primary task was to infer Teacher Preparation Committee members theories-in-use through an analysis of the conversational data obtained during individual interviews. Findings from the interviews were organized for feedback to Teacher Preparation Committee members (Argyris, 1993). The overall representation of Teacher Preparation Committee members' theories-in-use (see Cadray, 1995, pp. 58-116) was designed to illustrate the Traditional framing patterns (additive approaches to multicultural education) which virtually excluded Alternative framing patterns (transformative approaches to multicultural education). The researcher

hypothesized that these framing patterns were contributing factors to the gap between the SCU-COE mission and Teacher Preparation Committee members' theories-in-use. Representing the framing pattern in this manner made explicit the likely personal responsibility of each Teacher Preparation Committee member in maintaining the gap, a feature that is very important to a reflective feedback process (Argyris, 1993).

The researcher, acting as interventionist, designed an intervention process to attempt to reduce the gap between the college mission and the traditional practices of Teacher Preparation Committee members (Argyris, 1993). Two intervention sessions, a Feedback Session in June and a Change Session in July, were conducted with Teacher Preparation Committee members. Both intervention sessions were audio taped for retrospective analysis.

The agenda for the Feedback Session was designed to make the researcher's reasoning public about the nature of the mission-practice gap. Findings from action research and literature provided by the researcher were used to provoke inquiry among Teacher Preparation Committee members about the perceived gap between the college mission and the Traditional theories of teacher preparation held by committee members. One purpose of providing feedback was to assess the reactions of Teacher Preparation Committee members to the action research findings regarding the perceived gap. Committee members were encouraged to confirm or disconfirm the data representing their individual theories-in-use (Argyris, 1993).

The second intervention session, the Change Session, occurred two weeks after the Feedback Session. During the Change Session, the interventionist provided an opportunity for Teacher Preparation Committee members to publicly react to the feedback data including transcripts of conversations from the Feedback Session (Argyris, 1993). The interventionist took

advantage of several opportunities to focus committee members' attention on their personal and collective theories-in-use. The interventionist also encouraged participants to communicate about Alternatives frames of preparing teachers for cultural diversity. The goal of the Change Session was to develop Teacher Preparation Committee members' capacity to transform Traditional framing assumptions that were producing the mission-practice gap (Argyris, 1993).

Analytical Framework

Edward St. John (1990) proposed a developmental model which offers an explanation of how the reflective capacities of individual practitioners develop over time. According to St. John's developmental model (see Cadray's adaptation, Table 1), practitioners progress through four stages or levels of reflective choice-making. A description of each stage is offered below.

In the **Basic** stage all practitioners exhibit great similarity in how they make choices since they act mostly in an unconscious manner. They reflect on basic facts and the technical aspects of their practice to the virtual exclusion of reflection on the unintended consequences of their personal theories-in-use. Then, in the **Strategic** stage, one learns to adapt and adjust when basic theories break down. Personal characteristics and realizations develop the individual's capacity to reflect on the complexities of real world practice and the consequences of personal choices.

As these personal reflective skills develop, the individual practitioner can participate in probing, reflective conversations with others (the **Communicative** stage) -- communication that creates new possibilities for change. In the **Transformational** stage, individuals develop greater awareness of their collective unconscious behaviors and repeating dysfunctional patterns of practice, as well as a capacity to understand and choose new transformational patterns of practice (St. John & Burlew, 1993).

Table 1
STAGES OF REFLECTIVE CHOICE-MAKING FOR EDUCATORS

Stages	Dimensions: Internal	Dimensions: External
1: Basic	. Reflection on basic facts/techniques . Difficulty accepting personal responsibility for unintended consequences of choices . Assumes that the sociocultural contexts of schooling are not relevant	. Inability to make strategic adjustments as warranted by the context . Unwilling or reluctant to discuss issues related to unintended consequences of personal choices
2: Strategic	. Recognition that personal choices may be responsible for problems in real teaching and learning situations . Examination of possible alternatives from multiple, diverse perspectives	. Capacity to make strategic adjustments . Increased ability to work with others . Possible defensive and/or deflective reactions during reflective dialogue
3: Communicative	. Increased self-questioning and deeper reflection . Greater awareness of the fact that we behave differently from our intentions . Greater self-acceptance . Increased sense of self-efficacy	. Ability to anticipate consequences of personal and collective choices . Capacity to engage in meaningful public dialogue about personal responsibility as well as alternative action strategies . Developed coaching skills
4: Transformational	. Sense of personal and community responsibility for recognizing repeating dysfunctional patterns of practice . Greater understanding of the sociocultural contexts of schooling	. Ability to initiate new behaviors that facilitate transformation of dysfunctional patterns of practice in classrooms, schools, and communities

Note:
Cadray's (1998) Adaptation of Table I from: St. John, E. P. & Burlew, L. D. (1993). A developmental perspective on reflective practice: An application of Jung's theory of individuation. Louisiana Journal of Counseling, 4, (p. 13).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Practitioners who develop this degree of personal and collective knowledge tend to demonstrate a capacity to make meaningful and sustainable changes that may transform repeating dysfunctional patterns of practice within their organization (St. John & Burlew, 1993).

The next section provides an analysis of the development of Teacher Preparation Committee members' capacities to (1) reflect on the consequences of their Traditional framing assumptions, and (2) choose Alternative frames that could transform personal theories-in-use and the formal SCU-COE teacher preparation curriculum. The development of Teacher Preparation Committee members' reflective understanding is analyzed through the application of St. John's Stages of Reflective Choice-Making.

Results

Teacher Preparation Committee members progressed through all four levels of reflective understanding. These levels of reflective understanding, embodied in concrete conversational examples, provide a way of making sense of the development of Teacher Preparation Committee members' capacities to choose Alternative teacher preparation frames.

Basic Understanding

During the early episodes of both intervention sessions, Teacher Preparation Committee members wanted to know the basic facts. Their inquiries sought a better understanding of the information being presented by the interventionist. For example, after reviewing the Feedback data, most of Teacher Preparation Committee members choose to ask basic information-seeking questions:

> Does this [data] include secondary as well as elementary?
> The rest [of SCU-COE graduates] are being hired by [Washington] and other counties?
> Is there any hierarchy to these approaches to multicultural?

Why do you say it's [Teaching the Culturally Different] the least effective?
Was this statement made in conjunction with education in general or education at the K-12 level?

At the beginning of the Change Session Teacher Preparation Committee members were given the opportunity to respond to the Feedback Session. Teacher Preparation Committee members chose to repeat the pattern of asking information-seeking questions.

Where do our students go?
What happens to the other 80 percent?
How many come from those [surrounding] counties?
How many go back or want to go back to teach in those counties?
How many go back or want to go back to private and parochial schools?
What are the populations of those counties?

In this basic mode, Teacher Preparation Committee members developed an increased factual understanding of the sociocultural context surrounding their practice. Asking for and receiving basic information helped them become aware of distinctions between Traditional and Alternative teacher preparation frames. Teacher Preparation Committee members accepted the classification of their practices as Traditional, but were seemingly unconscious of any gap between the college mission and the way they framed their action strategies. The framing assumptions underlying their Traditional theories-in-use were not directly examined.

Strategic Understanding

A strategic level of reflective understanding emerged during the Feedback Session when Teacher Preparation Committee members were confronted with the notion that the ways by which they framed their individual practices could hinder the accomplishment of the college mission. The reflective inquiry shifted from the basic level to the strategic level as they reacted to the feedback data about their frames as well as to new information about Alternative frames.

After taking a few minutes to review the data, two of the three practitioners offered immediate reflections on how they framed their practices to prepare teachers. Craven was the first to respond. Conceding that he was "...very naive about multicultural education...", Craven recognized that his way of viewing the "...preparation of teachers...is not basically that much different...[for] any population." Then Jane recognized that she had already adjusted her practices by incorporating multicultural strategies into her practice. She assumed that teaching her students the importance of "...being sensitive to students needs...being able to incorporate a variety of learning styles...a lot of interpersonal skills..." was sufficient to prepare teachers to teach in diverse settings. Jane's response provided additional support for the assumption that additive multicultural strategies were already incorporated into Teacher Preparation Committee members' Traditional theories-in-use. Nell did not offer an immediate response to the feedback data. At this point it appeared that the feedback data and discussion had little effect on Teacher Preparation Committee members understanding any dysfunctional consequences that might result from the way they framed their practices.

However, as the Feedback Session progressed, Teacher Preparation Committee members demonstrated an initial awareness of the possible need to consider Alternative frames. For example, after reflecting more deeply, Craven and Nell were able to identify literature they had recently read which suggested the need to pay closer attention to preparing teachers to cope with gender inequity in the classroom. However, Teacher Preparation Committee members Traditional framing assumptions, which excluded attention to various intersections of inequality, remained dominant and basically out of reach for critical examination.

The strategic level of reflection was revisited during the Change Session. It should be noted also that Teacher Preparation Committee members had two weeks before the Change Session to reflect on the feedback data and discussion about their theories-in-use. After a brief phase of clarification questions, all Teacher Preparation Committee members, except Juliana, re-entered the strategic mode as a united front. Surprisingly, they attempted to deflect responsibility for the mission-practice gap onto a variety of organization factors beyond their control. They inquired into such notions as (a) most SCU-COE students not wanting to be prepared to teach in Southland County, (b) other counties collectively being a more important priority for strategic planning than just addressing the cultural diversity of Southland County, and (c) economic conditions possibly hampering the recruitment and preparation of candidates who might want to teach in Southland County. Critical inquiry into the consequences of Teacher Preparation Committee members' almost exclusive adherence to Traditional framing assumptions was effectively postponed.

Communicative Understanding

An observable shift in the way Teacher Preparation Committee members interacted during the Change Session occurred when they began to examine the underlying consequences of their collective choices and actions relative to the mission-practice gap. The development of Teacher Preparation Committee members' understanding of the limitations of their Traditional theories-in-use can be seen through the kinds of inquiries that emerged:

> How do we get our population that we have, through possible changes in multicultural experiences, willing and able to go into urban situations to teach?
> Do we prepare them adequately before we take them in for [inner city] field experiences?
> What can we do to sort of shake them up a little before we put them in [Southland County Schools]?

The development of this ability to collectively self-question was facilitated by an important change in Teacher Preparation Committee members' reactions after the Feedback Session. Although they devised further deflection strategies between the two intervention sessions, Teacher Preparation Committee members also reflected more deeply on the mismatch between the sociocultural context that envelops the college mission ideal and the strategic choices they had made relative to teacher preparation. Given the time to reflect between the sessions, Teacher Preparation Committee members developed the ability to talk more openly about the preparatory needs of prospective teachers which may be out of the reach of their Traditional theories-in-use. For example, they communicated about how "...some of our students go in looking for something to support their prejudice." They also talked about how some students had "...no idea that there were buildings like that...called schools." Teacher Preparation Committee members referred to the Cross (1993) article, How Do We Prepare Teachers To Improve Race Relations, as they recognized and communicated about the limitations of their Traditional theories-in-use relative to addressing these sociocultural realities.

The development of this communicative level of understanding made it easier for Teacher Preparation Committee members to talk about the patterns of practice that could be changed to improve the effectiveness of the teacher preparation curriculum. As deflective behaviors virtually disappeared during the latter phase of the Change Session, Teacher Preparation Committee members engaged in dialogue about how some of their students end up so frustrated after field experiences in inner city schools. For example, Nell was able to share her personal reflection on what happens to some of her students who teach in predominantly African American schools. Nell explained how some students might say something like "...a lesson was

wonderful..." or "...this was such a cute little book...", but she would often have to point out that "...it didn't have any effect at all on those kids you are working with."

Transformational Understanding

Up to this point, the analysis of the development of Teacher Preparation Committee members' reflective capacities has been confined to looking at conversational data drawn from the intervention sessions. Not a lot of focus was placed on hard evidentiary data relative to the development of Teacher Preparation Committee members' capacities to actually facilitate transformational processes. However, with regard to the development of transformational understanding, more than just illustrations of Teacher Preparation Committee members' developing ***awareness*** of Alternative teacher preparation frames are needed. This reflective analysis of the development of transformational capacities provides the reader with ***evidence of deliberate actions*** taken by Teacher Preparation Committee members to facilitate Alternative teacher preparation.

This section provides the reader with an analysis of the development of Teacher Preparation Committee members' capacity to enhance multiculturalism in the teacher preparation curriculum through personal and collective actions. Selected evidentiary data drawn from the thematic phase of the Change Session termed "Enhancing Multiculturalism" are offered. Additional pieces of evidence from a subsequent Teacher Preparation Committee meeting, one-on-one exit interviews, and course syllabi are also offered.

A deepening awareness of personal theories-in-use and dialogue about the limitations of collective patterns of practice enabled Teacher Preparation Committee members to initiate inquiry into Alternative teacher preparation frames. In response to conversations about the

inadequate preparation of prospective teachers to deal with cross-racial issues, Jane exemplified this emerging transformational understanding when she asked: "...how can we get them thinking about those things before the field experiences?"

Teacher Preparation Committee members brainstormed several possible alternatives for enhancing the multicultural strength of the preparation offered to SCU-COE students. Teacher Preparation Committee members were able to consider such alternatives practices as a required undergraduate multicultural course with content-specific threads running through the curriculum, portfolios for reflecting on feelings and beliefs about culturally diverse groups, and increased specific dialogue with Southland County teachers about racial and other aspects of diversity found in the public schools.

Ways of making African Americans more central in dialogue about learning to teach were also discussed by Teacher Preparation Committee members. For example, Nell suggested that one way to get to that was during field experiences in the schools. She said when students "...have to write a reflection...that's very often where we get to that discussion." Jane also recognized that such dialogue ought to take place. She suggested that such discussion should take place "...when our students go into those classrooms and they interact with those [African American] teachers in the classroom." Juliana and Craven did not comment on this issue.

Three Teacher Preparation Committee members (Craven, Jane, Juliana) were able to participate in the August committee meeting. Having left the university for reasons unrelated to the study, the interventionist was allowed to attend the August Teacher Preparation Committee meeting, but did not participate in the dialogue.

As Chair of the Teacher Preparation Committee, Jane began the meeting by distributing updated recommendations for changes in the teacher preparation curricula to be submitted to the full CID faculty. One of Jane's proposed changes for the professional component of the Secondary curriculum was the addition of a required Multicultural Education course. Craven was the first to react to the inclusion of the Multicultural Education course requirement. "...what's the rationale for including the multicultural course?" Jane responded, "...to make students more aware of the variety of strategies." Craven reiterated the concern he had raised during the Change Session: "...with all of these other courses we need...we don't need a whole course on multicultural education." As Craven suggested other possible ways of incorporating multiculturalism into the curriculum, Jane defended her proposal: "I don't think it could be built into [Ed 201] or [Ed 302]...personally I see it as an extension of classroom management...I'm convinced that they are related issues." Much of the subsequent dialogue about the Multicultural Education course involved a united defense of the proposal by Jane and Juliana in response to Craven's persistent objections.

Soon after the August meeting, each Teacher Preparation Committee member participated in a one-on-one exit interview with the interventionist. Each interview was generally conversational in nature which allowed Teacher Preparation Committee members to talk freely about the ways they now framed their own practices as well as the curricular changes that had been proposed. Two basic questions were used to provoke reflection on the process of enhancing multiculturalism in the SCU-COE teacher preparation program:

1. What effect did (will) the committee process, particularly our summer sessions, have on your personal teacher preparation practices?
2. What do you think about the proposed curricular changes which have emerged from the Teacher Preparation Committee process?

The interventionist assumed that the second question would elicit additional talk about the Alternative teacher preparation frames discussed during the June, July, and August Teacher Preparation Committee meetings. A brief summary of each Teacher Preparation Committee members' responses to these questions is provided below.

Nell responses indicated a noticeable change in the way she framed her practice. She said: "...[it] made me look at myself and what I was doing with students more carefully...they need to be better prepared for field experiences in inner city schools...there is a focus there that needs to be changed...." Nell also talked specifically about the Multicultural Education course proposal when asked about her thoughts on curricular change proposals: "Really what I'd like to see is some kind of multicultural course before we take students into schools for field experiences." She also commented that it should include a focus on "...African American culture and linguistics...."

Juliana responded to the first interview question by stating the question she had posed to herself after the last Teacher Preparation Committee meeting: "What exactly should our students get from a multicultural curriculum? Then she indicated "...I thought I had a multicultural curriculum...but now I'm beginning to sense that...it's at a very superficial level of what multicultural is." As she continued her response, Juliana exclaimed "...I can see a change in me and it happened just..last night...after our [Teacher Preparation Committee] meeting. My little multicultural lesson changed...it was my awareness of the stronger multicultural strategies that

made us directly focus on them." Juliana also said that her class discussion covered a variety of diversity issues including race relations, homogeneity of the teacher candidate pool, and how the "...traditional structure of schooling and higher education may be perpetuating social inequality."

Jane's responses to the first interview question indicated that the committee process had a significant effect for her. Admitting that she had been quite confused about multiculturalism prior to this process, Jane said that she did "...clarify some of the issues...I began to see some aspects of it a little more clearly...when I began hearing people's experiences and...reflections on it, it began to make more sense to me." Referring to Traditional and Alternative frames of multiculturalism, Jane also talked about how she came to realize that "...there are two ways that this concept can be interpreted...and I'm beginning to reconcile what I knew before and what I know now." Jane envisioned an immediate change in the way she approached her social studies methods course -- "...I'm more likely to venture into a variety of multicultural discussions...now that I'm getting a grip on it."

Analysis of interview responses by Craven and Carol did not provide salient evidence of actions geared toward enhancing multiculturalism in their personal practices. However, the reader should note that Carol did not participate in the summer Feedback and Change Sessions.

Finally, all Teacher Preparation Committee members submitted copies of syllabi for their past Spring and forthcoming Fall courses. The interventionist assumed that evidence of the enhancement of multiculturalism in course syllabi could be observed by comparing course descriptions (including the required text), objectives, and requirements.

The review of these aspects of Teacher Preparation Committee members' pre-intervention and post-intervention syllabi revealed very few substantive changes. No observable focus on

multicultural topics appeared in any aspect of the syllabi submitted by Nell, Craven, or Carol. Juliana's syllabi for the mathematics methods did not reveal an increased focus on multicultural topics, but the course descriptions for Spring and Fall did focus specific attention on multicultural education.

Analytical Summary

Practitioners who participated in this study progressed through four levels of reflective understanding. A summary of this developmental process is presented below.

At the **Basic** level of reflective understanding, practitioners chose to inquire into basic facts related to their practice and considered the social context of teacher preparation as irrelevant. In the basic mode, practitioners analyzed their traditional practices, but had difficulty accepting personal responsibility for the unintended consequences of their actions. They were also unwilling or reluctant to discuss such issues.

As practitioners moved into the **Strategic** mode of reflection, they began to recognize how their own theories-in-use may be partially responsible for dysfunctional patterns in the teacher preparation process. Although this realization elicited defensive and deflective reactions, each practitioner began to reflect more carefully on their individual framing assumptions. At this point, each person began the process of examining possible alternatives from multiple perspectives.

The next level of reflective understanding, the **Communicative** level, involved a distinct shift in the way practitioners interacted during the change process. Deflective and defensive reactions diminished as practitioners developed increased capacity for deeper personal reflection on and more meaningful communication about the limitations and consequences of their

collective practices. Practitioners were enabled to seriously discuss previously undiscussible issues pertaining to their collective theories-in-use.

Through deepening personal insights and public dialogue, practitioners began to recognize repeating dysfunctional patterns of practice. This **Transformational** level of understanding emanated from reflections on prior personal experiences. Practitioners developed increased awareness of alternative personal and curricular patterns of practice that have transformational capacity. Thus, practitioners developed the capacities to initiate new behaviors that facilitate change in dysfunctional patterns of personal and collective practices.

STUDY TWO

Intercultural communication undergirds the concept behind teachers' world views and the development of cross-cultural perspectives and competencies. Bennett (1989) points out that what teachers interpret as good or bad depends on their world views. A world view represents a person's collective socialized perspective of the world. Saral (1979) writes that "[e]ach world view has different underlying assumptions. Our normal state of consciousness is not something natural or given, nor is it universal across cultures. It is simply a specialized tool, a complex structure for coping with our environment" (p. 77). Teachers mediate their pedagogy and curriculum through their cultural framework or world view (Brislin, 1981; Shade, 1989). This study is interested in how teachers' world views or their understanding of other cultures are affected by a multicultural professional development seminar.

Some theorists and practitioners in the field of intercultural relations believe that people's world views, specifically their understanding of other cultures change in a developmental

sequence. This particular study employed an analytical developmental framework, the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) (Bennett, 1993) to examine teachers' comments regarding their thinking about cultural differences. In addition, the study investigated whether intervening variables such as years of teaching, teacher's race and gender correlated with changes in teacher thinking about other cultures.

Methodology

The Context and the Actors

The context for the study was the professional development center, CULTURES (Center for Urban Learning/Teaching and Urban Research in Education and Schools). The goal of the CULTURES program was "to create a professional development center that will assist practicing elementary and middle school teachers to work more effectively with culturally diverse students and enhance the quality of teaching and learning in urban schools" (Grant proposal). The program supports the goals of the National Professional Board of Teaching Standards. These include enhancing teachers' skills and knowledge in five roles: culturally responsive pedagogists, school systemic reformers, members of caring communities, reflective practitioners, and pedagogical content specialists. In addition, the CULTURES professional development seminar reflects many of the qualities of effective multicultural professional development. These include the maintenance of an on-going teacher cohort group, application of skills in teachers' own classrooms, contextualization of theory, and promotion of teacher reflection and dialogue.

The program works with cohorts of fifteen teachers who represent five different counties, various subject areas, and grades. The teachers experience forty clock hours of professional development including activities such as review of research findings on effective teaching,

cultural immersion trips in different cultural communities, personal reflection exercises, guest speakers, visits to classrooms of effective teachers, and action research projects. To enter the program a teacher must have three years of teaching experience in an urban diverse school, complete an application which includes recommendations from a parent and the principal, an essay, and biographical information, and participate in an entry interview. Once the teachers are accepted, they participate in the forty hour set of seminars, and on-going cohort group meetings. They receive a stipend and staff development units.

The program is structured along two developmental lines. The first is the sequencing of cross-cultural learning from the self to other. Learning about the concept of culture began with teachers reflecting on their own cultures and how it influenced their practice. Over the span of the forty hours the teachers gained more knowledge and skills in learning about other cultures. The second framework structured the cross-cultural activities from familiar to unfamiliar. Teachers began to learn about culture first by observing a familiar environment -- a classroom at a culturally diverse school. Subsequent activities increased in the level of "risk" and lack of familiarity, such as participation in the cross-cultural simulation Bafa Bafa, discussions with representatives from different cultural communities, and finally visits to various cultural communities around the city.

The teachers are part of a larger sample consisting of over seven cohorts of teachers who participated in CULTURES. Eleven teachers, six from group one and five from group two are included in this micro-study. These teachers were chosen based on two criteria: (a) they reflect the demographics of the total group of CULTURES teachers, and (b) at the time of this study their interview transcriptions were accessible. Their years of teaching experience range from 23

years to 2 years, with the majority of teachers in the field for over ten years. The participants included one African American males, three White females and seven African Americans females.

Data

Pre- and post-CULTURES interview data served as the basis for the analysis of stage identification in the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity. The pre-interview was administered up to a month prior to a teacher's involvement in the program. The post-interviews were conducted three to six months after the end of the CULTURES seminar. The pre-interview was fairly structured and focused on teachers' experiences and beliefs prior to taking the seminar. The post-interview was much more open encouraging the teachers to reflect on how the CULTURES program might have influenced their teaching, as well as their students' learning.

Demographic information from application forms and the interviews provided the second source of data. This information was used to identify patterns of relationships between the variables years of teaching, race, and gender and teachers' placement on the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity. These variables had been found to be salient in other studies examining cross-cultural change (Ottavi, Pope-Davis, & Dings 1994).

Analysis

Individual change in a teacher's cross-cultural thinking was measured using the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (Bennett, 1986), a developmental model that describes how people understand cultural differences. This particular model, based in social psychology and intercultural communication, was chosen because it supports the goals of CULTURES, and unlike previous categorizations of tolerance that have only allowed for two

(Allport, 1954) or three (Baldwin & Hecht, 1995) categories to describe a person's understanding of tolerance, it allows for us to examine the gradations as a person moves from one extreme, ethnocentrism or intolerance, to another extreme, ethnorelativism or tolerance. Difference is the organizing key to the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity; each stage represents a new way of experiencing difference (Bennett, 1986). The model has two aspects; the first part of the continuum has three stages of decreasing levels of ethnocentrism, and the second has three stages of increasing ethnorelativism. Table 2 provides descriptions of teacher behavior, attitude, and thinking at each stage.

An etic analysis using a structured template was applied to the data (Patton, 1990). Codes within the template were based on a 6 by 3 matrix structure, the six stages of Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity and their corresponding attitudinal, cognitive, and behavioral manifestations. Table 2 outlines the analytical matrix used to categorize teachers developmental stages. Because people do not naturally fall discretely into one single stage or category, the highest percentages of codes within a stage determined the placement of a teacher (e.g. Turner, 1991). Findings from the pre-CULTURES analysis were compared with findings from the post-CULTURES analysis to note any changes in stage placement along the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity.

A second analysis examined the relationship between group patterns based on the following variables, years of teaching, race, and gender and teachers' stage placement and stage change. These factors had been found to be salient in the culture learning process (Cox, 1982).[1]

Table 2
Analytical framework: Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity, stage by manifestation

1: Denial of difference	
Behavior:	Do not acknowledge nor make any references to children's cultural, socio-economic, ethnic, or racial backgrounds. May spend most of social and professional time in homogeneous groups. May acknowledge children's backgrounds by attributing children's social status, culture, ethnicity, or race to their behavior or learning in the classroom. Usually do not have experience with people from another culture or race.
Attitude:	Feel threatened. Show benign stereotyping, that if pushed will change into defensiveness.
Level of cognitive differentiation	Cognitively have not developed ability to differentiate between cultural differences -- culture considered one large category, which is the same as their own culture.
Stage 2. Defense	
Behavior:	Evaluate negatively anything different from own cultural perspective. Use cultural categories, stereotypes, and assumptions to inform discipline and interactions with children.
Attitude:	Feel more threatened that world view will be affected by other cultures. Feelings heightened because greater awareness of cultural differences than from previous stage. Hold an assimilationist attitude. Asks questions like why can't parents learn English? Why aren't these parents more caring for their children -- they never come to meetings. These children don't want to learn -- they just can't do it.
Level of cognitive:	Recognize cultural differences on a simple level. Usually compares these differences with own world view and evaluates them negatively in order to protect own world view. Do not integrate new learning of culture into world view.
Stage 3: Minimization	
Behavior:	Treat children same, despite varying cultures. Acknowledge superficially, such as focusing on holidays, food, and commonality of all cultures. Do not recognize institutional or cultural privilege. Deal with curriculum and pedagogy from melting pot perspective.
Attitude:	Feel connected to all cultures because everyone is a member of the human family. Desire everyone to get along.
Level of cognitive:	Can identify some cultural distinctions, but prefer to protect own world view by subsuming cultural differences into one big category.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2 (continued)

Stage 4: Acceptance	
Behavior:	Learn about children's culture and community through community visits, interaction, and secondary sources. Able to recognize various learning and communication styles. Acknowledge own world view that may differ from others. Base discipline and pedagogy on children's individual culture, rather than cultural and racial stereotypes. Begin to take responsibility for children's progress.
Attitude:	Feel curious and excited about learning and being with people from other cultures. Desire being with people who are from different cultures. May wish to teach in a more culturally diverse school.
Level of cognitive differentiation:	Can compare one's own culture with others at a deeper level, such as values and beliefs. More able to differentiate between cultures, such as the diversity within Latin cultures. Begin to recognize concept of privilege.
Stage 5: Adaptation	
Behavior:	Can take perspective of different children and parents. Adjust behavior to enhance cross-cultural communication. Use culturally appropriate metaphors to explain concepts. Assist children with mediating between home culture and school culture. Use cultural referents in teaching.
Attitude:	Feel more flexible in using various instructional techniques to meet children's needs. Feel competent regarding working with children of diverse background. Empathize with varying cultural perspectives.
Level of cognitive differentiation:	Possess high ability to differentiate between cultures. Connect knowledge of other cultures with one's own behavior.
Stage 6: Integration	
Behavior:	Shift perspective easily from one culture to the next. Evaluate the usefulness of an approach or content in the classroom from multiple perspectives. Examine and evaluate others' behaviors from alternative perspectives. Committed to using good judgment in choosing best response and instructional strategy for a given context.
Attitude:	Feel most comfortable with diverse cultures. May feel it necessary to take responsibility in helping people of different cultures understand one another.
Level of cognitive differentiation	Possess high ability to differentiate between cultures. Easily shift from one perspective to another or hold multiple perspectives at one time.

Note:
This outline is an adaptation of Bennett's Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (1986; 1993).

Reliability and Validity

To assure consistency within the coding, the coding of teacher interviews were conducted twice at two different points in time. This allowed the researcher to evaluate the consistency in codes. Some changes were made, but overall the coding remained consistent. After the second coding, the excerpts from all eleven teachers were divided among the categories attitude, behavior, and cognition by stage. This was done to assure consistency within each stage across all participants. There was a high level of consistency with only a few changes made.

The interviews were conducted by a team of seven researchers. All interviews were conducted on sight usually in the teachers' classrooms. The interview protocols were developed, tested, and refined over a three month period by the research team. To lessen any Hawthorne effects the post-interviews were conducted at least three months after the program, most teachers were interviewed four to five months later. This allowed teachers time to think about the course and to integrate any learning.

One major limitation of the study is its reliance on self-reported data. The teachers may have given information to the team members that they thought they wanted to hear. In addition, no classroom observations had been conducted to verify actions and behaviors reported by the teachers. This will be done in a future study of CULTURES teachers. Despite the possible limitations, the use of a variety of interviewers and the interviewers' strong rapport with the teachers may have increased the likelihood of candid answers to the questions.

Results

Three types of results are reported: (a) teachers' stages prior to CULTURES, (b) teachers' changes from pre- to post-CULTURES, and (c) patterns related to the interaction between the

variables, race, gender, years of teaching, and stage placement. Table 3 lists each teachers' responses by percentage for each stage of the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity. The stage with the largest percentage denotes the person's stage placement. For example, teacher 2 had six responses in her pre-interview that reflected either attitudinal, behavioral, or cognitive responses to culture. Seventeen percent of those six were coded as *minimization*, 83% as *acceptance*, and none as *adaptation*. Because the largest percentage of her comments fell in the *acceptance* stage, she would be categorized as *acceptance* on the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity.

Table 3
Teachers' placement on Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity Pre/Post CULTURES

Teacher	Time	Total responses	Minimization	Acceptance	Adaptation	Integration
2	pre	6	0%	100%a	0%	0%
	post	9	0%	78%	22%	0%
3	pre	1	0%	100%	0%	0%
	post	10	0%	87%	13%	0%
10	pre	2	100%	0%	0%	0%
	post	3	66%	33%	0%	0%
11	pre	5	0%	100%	0%	0%
	post	9	0%	89%	11%	0%
14	pre	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
	post	4	25%	75%	0%	0%
15	pre	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
	post	8	0%	75%	25%	0%
21	pre	2	50%	0%	50%	0%
	post	6	0%	83%	17%	0%
22	pre	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
	post	4	0%	75%	25%	0%
23	pre	2	33%	66%	0%	0%
	post	3	0%	100%	0%	0%
25	pre	2	0%	100%	0%	0%
	post	10	0%	90%	10%	0%
105	pre	4	0%	100%	0%	0%
	post	3	0%	66%	33%	0%

Notes:
a: Percentages are based on number of responses within a particular category for each time frame.

Pre-CULTURES

The majority of teachers placed in the first stage, *acceptance*, of the ethnorelative side of the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity. In this stage teachers show an interest in different cultures. They weave into their lessons information and perspectives from different cultural viewpoints. Teacher 22 shared a lesson that she used in her classroom:

> We did African Homeland Festival. I invited someone from Madagascar and we had a whole workshop day. The visitor talked about colonization and and how language came from that. We had a jewelry maker. The kids were enveloped in the day. One of the language teachers spoke of the French influence in Africa. The kids loved it – they made things and came away with things. [e22]

The criteria for entry into the CULTURES program may have influenced the high number of teachers who were coded in the *acceptance* stage. The program was advertised to attract those who had previous experience teaching in culturally diverse settings, as well as those interested in the topic. The Director of the program wanted people who would be open to learning more about culturally diverse communities and the relationship between culture, race, and student learning. According to Bennett (1993) people in the acceptance stage are in a perfect place, both affectively and cognitively, to engage with cross-cultural information and experiences.

The *acceptance* stage differs from a teacher's cultural exploration in the *minimization* stage in the ethnocentric half of the developmental model. Only one teacher (10) reflected a *minimization* stage in her pre-interview. She explored culture in a more superficial and stereotypical way. "I read a lot about other cultures and coming from Houston I'm used to many other cultures in my classroom. I had parents come in and talk about their cultures. We've eaten

with chopsticks. Never done home visits." The previous teacher (22) had explored culture from the perspective of the people in Madagascar by having a person from Madagascar discuss the influence of the colonizers and the role of language in the culture — a deeper perspective on culture. Teacher 10 used chopsticks to point out her involvement in culture, a more superficial and stereotypical perspective of culture.

One teacher (21) had an equal distribution between minimization and acceptance. Two of teacher 21's comments reflected the contradictory nature of thinking and behaving in two different stages. She stated that " children's behavior is sometimes related to their cultural background, and giving teachers information about students helps them to be more effective teachers." This comment had been coded *minimization*, because of its seeming intent toward using stereotypes to understand children's behavior. But in her relationship to parents she exhibited great empathy by sending home letters to parents "written in the language that the parents speak." The differences between the two stages may seem subtle. But teacher 21's belief about the role of culture in influencing children's behavior may lead toward stereotyping of children, which reflects an ethnocentric tendency. This particular case points out the limitations of the coding scheme and the interview protocol, which may not have provided us with a better understanding of what the teacher meant by "influencing children's behaviors."

Pre/Post-comparison

In the post-CULTURES interviews, teachers commented more on the relationship between culture and teaching. This may have been due to the structure of the interview questions or the fact that the CULTURES program deals with that relationship directly. Table 4 lists the teachers and their pre- and post-interview stage placement.

Table 4
Stage Change by Teacher

Teacher#	Race	Gender	Yrs. teaching	Pre-CULTURES	Post-CULTURES
2	White	Female	13	acceptance	acceptance
3	Black	Female	23	acceptance	acceptance
10	Black	Female	20	minimization	minimization
11	Black	Male	4	acceptance	acceptance
14	Black	Female	15	acceptance	acceptance
15	Black	Female	19	acceptance	acceptance
21	White	Female	15	minimization/adaptation	acceptance
22	Black	Female	7	acceptance	acceptance
23	Black	Female	9	acceptance	acceptance
25	White	Female	14	acceptance	acceptance
105	Black	Female	3	acceptance	acceptance

Though Table 4 seems to show little change in teacher's stage placement from the pre- to the post-interview, Table 3 points out the more subtle shifting within and between the stages that took place.

Even though each stage represents a new way of conceptualizing cultural differences, within a stage there can be greater levels of knowledge and understanding. For example, teacher 21 was coded both acceptance in the pre- and post- interviews. In her pre-interview she shared that she sent letters home written in the parents' language. In her post-interview, teacher 21 reflected a greater ability to differentiate within a culture, such as Latin people. She stated, "[I realized that] you can't lump all Hispanic kids together -- I have kids from Bolivia, Columbia, Venezuela, and they all have cultural differences."

Other teachers in their post-interviews, reflected a shifting upward toward more ethnorelativism, even though their stage placement had been denoted the same in their pre-interviews. For example, teacher 22's comments were 100% in the *acceptance* stage prior to

CULTURES. After the program 75% of her comments were coded as acceptance and 25% as *adaptation*. Though she would be identified as in the *acceptance* stage in her post-interview, the 25% in the *adaptation* stage reflected her increasing level of ethnorelativism. Before and after cultures Teacher 22 spoke about the importance of keeping good communication with her students and their parents. She stated in her pre-interview:

> I call them [the parents] a lot and maintain close communication. I believe that is key. I tell my students that once I teach them they are always mine. They are never free. I make as much contact as possible to know as much about them as I can. I do portfolio assessment and share that progress with the parents.

In her post-interview, teacher 22 showed a greater level of empathy for multilingual parents, as well as a deeper understanding of the concept of culture. This deeper understanding of culture, characteristic of the *adaptation* stage, usually leads to pedagogical and content modifications. She stated:

> Certainly, as I said before, the speaking with the different parents and knowing how -- to some degree -- how frustrating it is for them to function in the school system when they are placed in the American school system. ... And cultures aren't just about your ethnic, race, or whatever. It's about your style, your home situation, you may have another culture and it may be totally different than what I have. In terms of classroom behavior, a lot of African American students love to talk. They love to discuss — I understand that that's a lot of times - that it's cultural. I don't see that as being very rude because a lot of times they are talking about what we're [the teacher or class] is talking about. So I allow

> them the chance to do [sic] that because most of my students are African American and most of them are very active.

This teacher changed her pedagogy to accomodate her African American students. In addition, she began to recognize the influence of culture on the learning process, as well as the complex nature of culture.

All the teachers, except one (14), reflected in their exit interviews increasingly more ethnorelative comments. Teacher 14 was coded in the ethnorelative side in her pre- and post-interviews, *acceptance*, but she did make one *minimization* statement in her post-interview. No other teacher had made a comment from the minimization stage. In teacher 14's post-interview her comments exemplified the contradictory nature between beliefs that teachers may have as they are learning and changing. At one point she stated: "... even though we discussed the need to learn about other cultures, you have to know your students. We have to know where they're coming from in order to be effective teachers." This statement, understanding culture's influence on children, is typical of those in the *acceptance* stage. Later on in the same interview, teacher 14 said that "We're all in one world. So we not only have to recognize, but also need to do more in terms of appreciating ... the contributions of cultures." Though it is true that teachers need to recognize the contributions of cultures, this comment about contributions and viewing cultures in "one world", Bennett (1993) stated is typical of those in the *minimization* stage. Banks (1994) in his model of Typology of Ethnicity also cautioned against teachers focusing on the contributions and holiday aspect of a culture. An acceptance view of contributions would focus on the multiple perspectives each culture offers and the process of learning about those contributions.

A further conversation with the teacher would bring more clarity regarding the seemingly contradictory nature of her comments.

Though no teacher shifted one whole stage from *acceptance* to *adaptation*, their comments ranged from 11% to 33% of them in the *adaptation* stage. This overlap and shifting may reflect the progressive and developmental nature in developing cross-cultural understanding. Rather than a sharp change from one stage to the next, people gradually shift and change their behaviors and beliefs in a more complex multi-stage manner with the direction always toward more ethnorelative behavior and beliefs.

An area of concern in teacher education has been change in behavior. Overall, the teachers spoke about a range of changes in their behaviors. These included using interpreters for meetings with parents, reading more multicultural books and studying languages, visiting more ethnic restaurants. In terms of their classroom practice, teachers increased their infusion of various cultural perspectives in the classroom, taught Spanish to their children and encouraged children to learn about different cultures. Teachers also reflected changes in their thinking such as not basing their understanding of children on racial and cultural stereotypes. Some teachers discussed behaviors in the adaptation stage that reflected how they began to serve as cultural mediators, as well as how they have obtained a deeper understanding of the influence of culture on one's own behavior. One teacher used lessons to show the different dialects such as Black English, Yiddish, Pennsylvania Dutch, and then compared it with standard English. A couple teachers have encouraged the school administrators to have all important school information translated into various languages. And another teacher commented on how she is more conscientious about <u>what</u> she says and <u>how</u> she says it in front of others.

Role of variables

Other studies examining the influence of an intervention on teachers (Cox, 1983) and counselors'(Ottavi,Pope-Davis, &, Dings, 1994) cross-cultural world views found that there are some intervening variables that may have influenced the affect of the intervention on particular people. In this particular mini-study three variables were examined for their influence on teacher's stage placement, race, gender, and years teaching.

Gender and race. Because of the small group or perhaps because these factors are not salient in the intercultural learning process, no patterns emerged regarding race or gender. One Black male (11), which is reflective of the percentage of males in general in the whole CULTURES program, participated in the program. His placement did not differ from any of the women.

Seven Black women and threeWhite women were in the study's sample. The three White women did not show any particular patterns. Teacher 21, a White teacher, did have an unusual finding (discussed earlier in the results), in that she had comments in her pre-interview that were coded in both the ethnocentric and ethnorelative sides of the model. Her post-interview was typical of the majority of the teachers in the study. No specific patterns were found among the Black teachers. Teacher 14 was the only teacher to have some regressive comments in her post-interview, discussed earlier in the results section, but she was a single case. Perhaps with a larger set of CULTURES teachers some patterns may emerge.

Years of Teaching. Four teachers (11, 22, 23, 105) had less than ten years of experience in urban diverse classrooms. There were no apparent patterns between those with more than ten years and those with less. One of the criteria for being admitted into the CULTURES program is

three years of teaching in a culturally diverse school. This may preclude any possible novice effect that other studies have shown (eg. Cox, 1983; Smith, 1983). Perhaps with a larger data base the novice effect would show up more clearly.

Analytical Summary

Overall the analysis revealed that teachers did change in their view of cultural differences and in some of their cross-cultural behaviors and those changes could be captured by the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity stage descriptions. The developmental framework assisted us in identifying changes in thinking and behavior. The more subtle changes, such as those within a single stage, may go unnoticed by teacher educators, administrators, or the teachers themselves. The developmental framework provides a lens through which to examine and measure change in cross-cultural attitudes, behavior, and beliefs, no matter how small or gradual.

Teachers' growth in their cross-cultural knowledge and thinking may have been nurtured by the structure and content of the course. Though this small study does not experimentally test the effect of various aspects of the seminar, teachers' comments and their evaluation point to the effectiveness of having such a program based on principles of adult learning, as well as a developmental framework. No teachers commented on being fearful or in distress because of any event or aspect of the course. The course was designed to have teachers participate in activities arranged in increasingly higher levels of risk and participate in a supportive and open environment. This particular theoretical structure may have supported and encouraged teachers to engage at an optimal level. In addition, teachers' learner readiness, according to the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity stage placements, was at an optimal place with

the majority of teachers in the *acceptance* stage. This may have facilitated the movement toward more ethnorelative behavior and thinking that was exhibited in most of the teachers' exit interviews.

The next section will discuss more specifically the implications such developmental approaches may have for teacher education and professional development for teachers.

Implications

The two studies presented in this paper provide us with perspectives of teacher educators and teachers as they developed their reflective capacity and intercultural sensitivity. The first study discussed this process within the context of a teacher education program undergoing curricular revision, while the second occurred within a structured environment of a professional development program for classroom teachers. Both studies employed frameworks that are useful in urban multicultural professional development and teacher education. Implications drawn from these two studies are indicated below.

There are formidable barriers to educational transformation even when internally-generated interventions are employed. In agreement with Sarason (1990), we concluded that individuals and groups involved in increasing their multicultural capacity have extraordinary difficulty facing "...the fact of intractability to change and our inability to consider alternatives. To be able to consider alternatives, one must first be dissatisfied with things as they are" (p. 110). Reflection on knowledge and action, and their relative level of incompatibility, becomes a catalyst for change in that it creates cognitive dissonance (Fetstinger, 1957) or cultural disequilibrium (Taylor, 1994) within the learner. Its emotional nature is the driving force that pushes the participant to become interculturally competent (Taylor, 1994).

To induce such catalytic change, teacher educators must create a climate and environment conducive to in-depth reflection on the inevitable gap between what practitioners espouse and what they actually do. Critical analysis of practitioners' work and the context in which it is performed should be a central component of the learning environment. The teacher educator (facilitator) encourages learners to be open to diverse perspectives and to give full attention to alternative possibilities. Viewpoints derived from various stage perspectives are heard and reflected upon. Any claims or judgements made within the community of learners are illustrated with "relatively directly observable data, and the surfacing of conflicting views is encouraged in order to facilitate public testing of them" (Argyris, 1987, p. 98).

In addition, the need for long term developmentally-focused multicultural experiences in the learning environment can not be understated. But such experiences must come at a time when the participants are ready. For example, Teacher Preparation Committee members spent considerable time reflecting on their personal backgrounds and the traditional strategies which guided their practice before they were asked to publicly reflect on alternative multicultural frames. The structure of experiences and cultural knowledge in the CULTURES program were sequenced to ensure that the leaner moved from familiar to least familiar, and from knowledge of self to knowledge of others. For example, teachers did not enter cross-cultural communities until the end of the program.

Developmental frameworks can assist teacher educators with the construction of optimal learning environments through the sequencing of the processes and content of reflection. For example, an educator may employ the Reflective Choice-Making Model or the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity as a structure that informs what pedagogical tools and content

would be most appropriate for a particular learner's level of reflective capacity and intercultural sensitivity. If the content and sequence are too challenging then the catalyst for change becomes too distressing. At this point the learner may opt to not engage in the process. But if the content and processes are appropriately challenging, just one stage or so above where the average learner is, then the learner is more likely to reflect more deeply and consider alternative perspectives. As participant learning progresses, the developmental framework provides a series of growth check points. Rather than expect dramatic changes that may produce frustration and disappointment for the learner and facilitator, both can see the incremental growth described by stage models such as Reflective Choice-Making and Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity.

The incremental processes involved in developing culturally responsive educators need to be encased in an on-going transformational process. Stable support groups positively influenced the change process in each study; in Study One through the Teacher Preparation Committee and in Study Two through the teacher cohort groups. These groups can provide support as a sounding board, a source of motivation, and a cadre for public reflection. One of the most effective ways to assure on-going learning is to institutionalize a dynamic process of multicultural teacher education. This process will require that institutional leaders, such as college deans and school administrators, buy into the concept that developing culturally responsive educators will also foster educational transformation.

The developmental frameworks presented in this report, the Reflective Choice-Making Model and the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity, can assist teacher educators and teachers in understanding the subtleties of reflective and intercultural development. More importantly, the frameworks provide maps of how our multicultural thinking actually develop

over time. Through the use of these maps we might be able to better plan teacher education programs, and begin to systematically structure and evaluate urban multicultural professional development initiatives designed to educate culturally responsive educators.

References

Allport, (1954). The nature of prejudice. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Argyris, C. & Schon, D. (1978). Organizational learning. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Argyris, C., Putnam, R., & Smith, D. M. (1987). Action science. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Argyris, C. (1993). Knowledge for action: A guide to overcoming barriers to organizational change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Baker, G .C. (1983). Preparing teachers to teach. In G. C. Baker Planning and organizing for multicultural Instruction (pp. 41-62).

Baldwin, J. R. & Hecht, M. L. (1995). The layer perspective of cultural (in)tolerance(s): The roots of a multidisciplinary approach. In R. L. Wiseman (Ed.). Intercultural communication theory. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Banks, J. (1994). Multiethnic education: Theory and practice. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bennett, C. (1989). Teaching students as they would be taught: The importance of cultural perspective. In B. J. Shade, Culture, style and the educative Process (pp. 71-86). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Bennett, C. (1995). Preparing teachers for cultural diversity and national standards of academic excellence. Journal of Teacher Education, 46, 259-266.

Bennett, J. (1993). Cultural marginality: Identity issues in training. In M. Paige (Ed.), Cross-cultural orientation (pp. 109 - 136). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Bennett, M. J. (1993). Towards ethnorelativism: A developmental model of intercultural sensitivity. In M. Paige (Ed.), Cross-cultural orientation (pp. 27-69). Lanham, MD: University press of America.

Brislin, R. (1981). Cross-cultural encounters. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon.

Cadray, J. (1995). Enhancing multiculturalism in a teacher preparation program: A reflective analysis of a practitioner's intervention. Dissertation Abstracts International, 57(8) (University Microfilms No. 9701563).

Children's Defense Fund. (1994). The state of America's children:Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: Children's Defense Fund.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1995, November). Knowledge, skills, and experiences for teaching culturally diverse learners: A perspective for practicing teachers. Paper presented at the Invitational conference on Defining the Knowledge Base for Urban Teacher Education, Emory University, Atlanta, GA.

Cox, B. B. (1982). A research study focusing on Banks' typology of ethnicity as related to elementary teachers multicultural experiences. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of Education, University of Houston, TX.

Cross, B. E. (1993, May). How do we prepare teachers to improve race relations. Educational Leadership, 50, 64-65.

Gillette, M., & Boyle-Biase, M. (1995, April). Multicultural education at the graduate level: Assisting teachers in developing multicultural perspective. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Grant, C., & Secada, W. G. (1990). Preparing teachers for diversity. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 403-422). New York: Macmillan.

Grant, C. & Tate, W. (1995). Multicultural education through the lens of the multicultural education research literature. In J. A. Banks & C. M. Banks (Eds.), Handbook of research on multicultural education (pp. 145-166). New York: Macmillan.

Gudykunst, W. B., & Kim, Y. Y. (1984). Communicating with strangers: An approach to intercultural communication. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Hardiman, R. (1982). White identity development: A process oriented model for describing the racial consciousness of White Americans. Dissertation Abstracts International, 43, 104A.

Helms, J. E. (Ed.). (1990). Black and White racial identity: Theory, research, and practice. New York: Greenwood.

Inger, M. (1995). Teacher collaboration in urban secondary schools. ERIC Review, 3, (3), 28 - 30.

Irvine, J. J. (1990). Black students and school failure: Policies, practices, and prescriptions. New York: Greenwood Press.

Jones, W. T. (1990). Perspectives on ethnicity. In L. Moore (Ed.), Evolving theoretical perspectives on students. New Directions for Student Services, No. 51, pp. 59-72. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lawrence, S. M., & Tatum, B .D. (1997). Teachers in transition: The impact of anti-racist professional development on classroom practice. Teachers College Record, 99(1), 162 - 178..

Little, J. W. (1993). Teachers' professional development in a climate of educational reform. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 15, 129-151.

Loevinger, J. Ego development: Conceptions and theories. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Moll, L., & Gonzalez, N. (1997). Teachers as social scientists: Learning about culture from household research. In P. Hall (Ed.), Race, ethnicity, and multiculturalism: Policy and practice (pp. 89-114). London: Garland Publishing.

Myers, L. J., Speight, S. L., Highlen, P. S., Chickaco, I. C., Reynolds, A. L., Adams, E. M., & Hanley, C. P. (1991). Identity development and world view: Toward an optimal conceptualization. Journal of Counseling & Development, 70, 54-63.

Nieto, S., & Rolon, C. (1995, November). The preparation and professional development of teachers: A perspective from two Latinas. Paper presented at the Invitational conference on Defining the Knowledge Base for Urban Teacher Education, Emory University, Atlanta, GA.

Ottavi, T. M., Pope-Davis, D. B., & Dings, J. G. (1994). Relationship between White racial identity attitudes and self-reported multicultural counseling competencies. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 41, 149-154.

Paige, M. (1993). On the nature of intercultural experiences and intercultural education. In M. Paige (Ed.), Cross-cultural orientation (p.1 -21). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Patton, M. (1990). Qualitatitive evaluation and research methods. Newbury Park, London: Sage.

Rios, F. A.(Ed.) (1996). Teacher thinking in cultural contexts. Albany: State University of New York.

Rowe, W., Bennett, S. K., & Atkinson, D. R. (1994). White racial identity models: A critique and alternative proposal. The Counseling Psychologist, 22(1), 129-146

Saral, T. B. (1979). The consciousness theory of intercultural communication. In M. K. Asante, E. Newmark, and C.A. Black (Eds), Handbook of intercultural communication (pp. 77-84). Beverly Hills; CA:Sage.

Sarason, S. B. The predictable failure of educational reform: Can we change course before it's too late? San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shade, B. J. (Ed.). (1989). Culture, style and the educative process. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Singer, M. R. (1987). Intercultural Communication: A perceptual approach. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Sleeter, C. E. (1992). Keepers of the American dream: A study of staff development and multicultural education. Washington, D.C.: The Falmer Press.

Smith, A. J. (1983). The relationship of teachers preparedness in multicu!tural education to levels of ethnic awareness and multicultural exposure among elementary school certified personnel. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, Pullman, Washington.

Sparks, D., & Loucks-Horsley, S. (1989). Five models of staff development for teachers. Journal of Staff Development, 10, 40-57.

St. John, E. P. (1990). A developmental perspective on reflective leadership. Paper presented at the Mid-South Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

St. John, E. P. & Burlew, L. D. (1993). A developmental perspective on reflective practice: An application of Jung's theory of individuation. Louisiana Journal of Counseling, 4, 9-24.

Taylor, E. W. (1994). Interucltural competency: A transformative learning process. Adult Education Quarterly, 44 (3), 154-174.

Turner, D. A. (1991). Assessing the intercultural sensitivity of American expatriates in Kuwait. Unpublished thesis, Portland State University,Portland, Oregon.

Villegas, A. M. (1991). Culturally responsive pedagogy for the 1990s and beyond., Trends and Issues Paper No. 6. Washington D.C. : ERIC Clearinghouse on teacher education:

Wingard, J. M. (1995). Experienced urban teacher and professional development: A study of perceived barriers to change. Unpublished Master Thesis, Emory University, Atlanta, GA.

Woods, F. H., & Thompson, S. R. (1993). Assumptions about staff development based on research and best practice. Journal of Staff Development, 14, (4), 52 - 57.

Zeichner, K. M. (1994). Teacher socialization for cultural diversity. In J. Sikula, T. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.) Handbook of research on teacher education. New York: Macmillan.

Endnotes

1. Because of the limitations of space, a full discussion of the methodology, its limitations, reliability, and validity have been left out. For those interested in further details on the methodology, contact the authors.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE